

REMARKS

Claims 1-25 remain in the application with claims 1, 7, 8, 14, 15, and 22-25 having been amended hereby. Claims 1, 7, 8, 14, 15 and 21-25 are in independent form.

In response to the examiner's objection to the Title of the Invention, the Title has been amended hereby.

Reconsideration is respectfully requested of the rejection of independent claim 1 under 35 U.S.C. 102(e), as being anticipated by Owens et al. (US Patent No. 6,633,630).

Independent claim 1 pertains to an information processing apparatus for processing a transmission message among a plurality of sites connected via a network. The apparatus comprises a message reception part that receives a message to execute a prescribed piece of reception processing. The apparatus comprises a rule accumulation part that accumulates a plurality of rules for executing message processing. The apparatus comprises a message conversion part that executes message conversion processing according to the plurality of rules accumulated in the rule accumulation part. The apparatus comprises a message transmission part that executes a prescribed piece of transmission processing of the converted message. The message is used to distribute information among a plurality of traders at the plurality of sites.

Owens et al. relates to communications system such as for email, voice mail and facsimile communications systems. These communications systems are seamlessly integrated to allow for access to all communications systems from a single access point.

Owens et al. does not teach that the message is used to distribute information among a plurality of traders at the plurality of sites. The claims have been amended hereby to emphasize this distinction.

The Office Action alleges that Owens et al. teaches an information processing apparatus for processing a transmission message among a plurality of sites connected via a network, the apparatus comprising a message reception part that receives a message to execute a prescribed piece of reception processing. However, Owens et al., as cited by the Office Action, shows a "message receiver" that is a human user (see, for example, Fig. 1, item 36 showing an illustration of a man wearing a necktie captioned "message receiver"). I.e., the message receiver of Owens et al. is a person who is to receive a message, presumably, the person who the email, voicemail and facsimiles of Owen et al. are directed to. It is respectfully submitted that the message receiver of Owen et al. is not shown to, or himself capable of, "executing a prescribed piece of reception processing."

The Office Action additionally alleges that Owens et al.

teaches "a message conversion part that executes message conversion." However, the rules of Owens et al., as cited by the Office Action, define forwarding options for the emails, voicemails and facsimiles so that these forms of communication may be directed to the single access point. The rules of Owens et al. do not appear to be rules for "executing message conversion processing," as claimed by amended independent claim 1.

The Office Action additionally alleges that Owens et al. teaches "a message conversion part that executes message conversion processing according to the plurality of rules accumulated in the rule accumulation part." However, as noted above, the rules of Owens et al. do not relate to message conversion processing. Moreover, Owens et al. does not appear to execute message conversion processing. The portions of Owens et al. cited by the Office Action instead appear to relate to the forwarding of messages.

Similarly, the Office Action alleges that Owens et al. teaches "a message transmission part that executes a prescribed piece of transmission processing of the converted message" but, as previously noted, Owens et al. does not appear to teach transmission processing of a converted message.

Therefore, independent claim 1 is patentable over the cited

art for at least the above reasons. Independent claims 8, 15 and 22-25 and dependent claims 2-6, 9-13 and 16-20 are believed to be patentable over the cited art for at least similar reasons.

Reconsideration is respectfully requested of the rejection of independent claim 7 under 35 U.S.C. 102(e), as being anticipated by Owens et al.

Independent claim 7 relates to an information processing apparatus for processing a transmission message among a plurality of sites connected via a network. The apparatus comprises a message broker that commits to an application processing of data that becomes necessary when message conversion is performed among the plurality of sites. The apparatus comprises a message translator that performs mutual conversion between message formats according to a prescribed conditional sentence in response to an arrival of a field serving as a trigger in a message format. The apparatus comprises a message router that adds a destination address to the message according to a prescribed piece of identification information contained in the message. The apparatus comprises a B2B connector that provides a message exchange interface between a system and a site outside the system. The apparatus comprises a gateway that provides a local message exchange interface between the system and a local site inside the system. The message is used to distribute

information among a plurality of traders at the plurality of sites.

Owens et al. does not teach that the message is used to distribute information among a plurality of traders at the plurality of sites. The claims have been amended hereby to emphasize this distinction.

The Office Action alleges that Owens et al. teaches "a message broker that commits to an application processing of data that becomes necessary when message conversion is performed among the plurality of sites." However, the cited portion of Owens et al. relates to a "message sender." It is submitted that the "message sender" of Owens et al. is not related to the "message broker" of independent claim 7 because the message sender of Owen et al. is a person (shown as a figure of a woman seated at a computer terminal). The message sender of Owens et al. additionally does not commit to an application processing of data.

Additionally, there does not appear to be any teaching or suggestion in Owens et al. that the "apparatus comprises a message translator that performs mutual conversion between message formats according to a prescribed conditional sentence *in response to an arrival of a field serving as a trigger in a message format.*" Specifically, no "field serving as a trigger in

a message format" can be found in Owens et al. The portions of Owens et al. cited by the Office Action appear to relate to allowing access to an e-mail message via telephone or access to a telephone message via e-mail, but there is no indication that a field serves as a trigger in a message format.

Moreover, Owens et al. fails to teach or suggest that the apparatus comprises "a B2B connector that provides a message exchange interface between a system and a site outside the system." The cited portion of Owens et al. relates to interfaces between a message sender and a message receiver. As the message sender and message receiver are human users, the transfer of messages between sender and receiver, as described in Owens et al. is not a B2B connector that provides a message exchange interface between a system and a site outside the system.

Therefore, independent claim 7 is patentable over the cited art for at least the above reasons. Independent claims 14 and 21 are believed to be patentable over the cited art for at least similar reasons.

The Office Action has rejected dependent claims 6, 13 and 20 under 34 U.S.C. 103(a) as unpatentable over Owens et al. in view of Matsu (U.S. Patent Number 5,634,005). It is believed that these rejections are overcome by the above arguments and amendment.

Therefore, by reason of the amendments made to the claims hereby, as well as the above remarks, it is respectfully submitted that Mizushima et al., as taught by the present invention and as recited in the amended claims, is neither shown nor suggested in the cited references.

The references cited as of interest have been reviewed and are not seen to show or suggest the present invention as recited in the amended claims.

Favorable reconsideration is earnestly solicited.

Respectfully submitted,

COOPER & DUNHAM LLP


Jay H. Maioli
Reg. No. 27, 213

JHM/JBG